Published monthly by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.
Subscription price, $2.00 per annum, payable strictly in advance.
In St. Louis, Canada, and in foreign countries, $2.10.
Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized October 5, 1918.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Published by the

Evangelical Lutheran Synod

of

Missouri, Ohio, and Other States.

Vol. VII. — NOVEMBER, 1927.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
ST. LOUIS, MO.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Edited by the Faculty of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.

Prof. W. Arndt, *Managing Editor pro tem.*, 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Items whose authorship is not indicated are by the managing editor *pro tem.*

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?	321
Luther's Ninety-five Theses in the Light of Testimony Against Indulgences Before the Reformation	330
The Theological Observer	336
Book Review	345

Please Take Notice.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Nov 27" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. VII. NOVEMBER, 1927. No. 11.

Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?*

W. H. T. DAU, Valparaiso, Ind.

1. The Morning after the Great Speech.

Luther's answer "without horns and teeth" at the conclusion of his great speech before the Diet on April 18, 1521, created a fearful dilemma for the Romanists at Worms. That evening, while Luther sat, surrounded by admiring friends, in his room at the hostel of the Knights of St. John and his tense mind relaxed in cheerful conversation, agitated consultations took place elsewhere. His answer, upon close scrutiny, appeared to his adversaries a plain challenge. Luther had to the end withstood the vehement pressure of his examiner Eck for the coveted monosyllabic answer to the question whether he would recant. He had said neither yes nor no, but he had solemnly declared himself ready to say either yes or no after a proper argument. The opposition could not charge Luther with sullenness or contumacy; he had not refused recantation, but had practically paved the way for it by the only process that would have been honorable to himself and his adversaries. They saw clearly the intention which Luther afterwards acknowledged in several letters, to bring on a discussion "with a doctor or fifty who were to overcome the monk in an honest argument." [1] The intolerable situation which Aleander had always foreseen and pointed out as dreadful to a conscien-

* The substance of this article was read at Union Seminary, New York, December 28, 1925, at the annual meeting of the American Society of Church History.

1) XV, 1936. 1902. 1904. — In this contribution the St. L. edition of Luther's Works is cited by simple Roman and Arabic numerals, for volume and column. RA stands for *Reichstagsakten;* DTC, for Dau, *At the Tribunal of Caesar;* HAL, for Hausrath, *Aleander und Luther;* EE, for Erlangen Edition; BAL, for Brieger, *Aleander und Luther;* EB, for Enders, *Briefwechsel,* in Erlangen edition of Luther's Works; FU, for Foerstemann, *Urkundenbuch;* FNU, for Foerstemann, *Neues Urkundenbuch.*

tious Romanist had actually arisen after Luther's speech at the Diet: the Pope's decision was to be debated at the Diet and the Diet turned into a council.

Such a procedure the Romanists were resolved not to permit. But they felt that to issue a peremptory order to Luther to return to Wittenberg that same evening would only increase Luther's prestige and their own shame. Luther must not be permitted to leave Worms unrefuted and unconvicted, glorying that he had called his prosecutors' bluff and that they still owed him an answer. Something must be done at least that looked like an effort to refute Luther. His writings, indeed, must never be formally debated on the floor of the Diet; for if that were done, the argument would inevitably turn out an indictment of the papacy. Accordingly, a middle course was chosen, a compromise between fairness and propriety, on the one hand, and cunning and tyranny, on the other: Luther was to be granted a further hearing before a commission, to which hearing the general public was not to be admitted. The measure plainly revealed the perplexity of its devisers and the great moral and tactical victory which Luther had won by his speech.

It was still early in the morning, half past eight (so stated in a letter to Duke William of Bavaria),[2] on Friday, April 19, when a meeting of the Electors took place at the *Bischofshof*, where the Emperor lodged. Many persons of princely rank were in attendance, and presently also the inevitable Aleander made his appearance. The young Emperor must have spent a busy night; for he opened the meeting with the heroic proposition to cut all negotiations with Luther short by sending him home and then issuing a decree of outlawry against him; and when the Electors asked him to delay the execution of this plan until they had fully considered it, Charles V had a document in French read to them, composed by himself during the night.[3] In this document the Emperor declared that all his ancestors had been loyal adherents of the Catholic faith, and he intended to walk in their footsteps. To allow a single monk to contradict the decrees of the Council of Constance and the uniform tradition of the Church would be intolerable. He would not suffer the suspicion to fall upon his administration that he was fostering heresy. After the stubborn attitude which he had seen Luther assume on the preceding day, he had regretted having been so tardy in taking measures against

2) RA, II, 853. 3) RA, II, No. 83; BAL, 153; FNU, p. 75.

him. Under no condition would he grant him a further hearing, but was resolved to send him back with the safe-conduct which he had promised him, forbidding him, however, to preach to the people on his way home, lest he excite a tumult. After that he would proceed against him as against a convicted heretic. Let the Diet now do what it had promised before Luther's citation to Worms, *viz.*, rise in defense of the true faith.

To what extent Glapion, the Emperor's confessor, must be credited with this determined stand of Charles V remains a matter of conjecture. If the Emperor acted independently of any outside influence, his declaration revealed the bigoted zeal inculcated upon him by his stanch Catholic educators, the Dominicans and Franciscans, who had molded the character of the boy Charles. The stern decision of the hitherto pliant and yielding young monarch was a surprise to all. Jerome de Medici reports to Frederick Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua: "And so he had a letter read which was by his own hand; and one of his secretaries who was present when he wrote it testifies that it was written by His Majesty without having consulted any person." [4]

The German princes had to have the Emperor's French declaration translated to them. When they understood it, they turned pale like dead men. So Aleander reports, who had received his first glimpse of the real character of Charles V, and now broke forth in a hymn of praise over this pious monarch, declaring that, after all, the citation of Luther had been the only correct procedure. At Rome a solemn consistory was assembled on May 11 to hear the Emperor's statement, sent thither by the Emperor himself.[5]

Aleander began writing a report to Rome, upon information from Eck, that the Electors had given their consent to procedures against Luther.[6] This was the truth; with four votes against two a resolution had been adopted to burn Luther's books at once, to send him home, and then to outlaw him.[7] The Electors' consent had been given reluctantly. Fuerstenberg states that they had advised against executing the Emperor's plan, because that would cause rioting and sedition.[8] Even a good Catholic like Duke Louis of Bavaria, in a letter to his brother William, showed that he felt

---

4) RA, II, 855: "Et cosi fece legere una littera, quale era di sua propria mano; et ni afferma un suo secretano, qual era presente quando la serisse, esser stata composta da sua Maesta scuza conontta di personna alcuna."

5) Balan, 214.

6) RA, II, 867.

7) RA, 596.

8) RA, II, 869. 872.

worried over the prospect that the Emperor would stick to his resolution.[9])

There was reason for worry. A distinct feeling of unrest had pervaded the city of Worms for some time. Cochlaeus wrote that the Lutherans were blaming the boy Emperor for being a tool of the bishops.[10]) Placards were found posted at street-corners, some of which took Luther's side, while others spoke out against him.[11]) Wild and noisy scenes were enacted in the streets at night. Fuerstenberg found a threatening bulletin affixed to the city hall, to this effect: "Having covenanted and sworn not to forsake righteous Luther, four hundred noblemen stand pledged and serve notice on the princes and the gentlemen from Rome, principally, however, on the Bishop of Mayence, that we intend serious hostility, because we perceive that honor and divine right are to be suppressed after all, and tyranny is to be practised with the aid of priests, though no names are revealed. This writing is paltry, but it intends great damage. A war will be launched with 8,000 men." The poster was signed: *"Bundschuh, Bundschuh, Bundschuh."* [12]) Another report mentioned that even 100,000 stood ready to rise in defense of Luther.[13]) It was rumored that the slogan *"Bundschuh"* had been heard in the streets at night,[14]) and that in the Emperor's room a note had been picked up containing these words: "Woe to the land whose king is a child!" [15]) George Vogler, the secretary of Margrave Casimir, interpreted the placard at the city hall as a warning to the Emperor not to condemn Luther unheard, or 400 noblemen, able to muster 8,000 men, mounted and unmounted,

---

9) RA, II, 869.

10) *Commentaria de Actis et Scriptis Lutheri.* Mayence, 1549, p. 36.

11) Erl. Ed., Op. Lat., VI, 16.

12) Fuerstenberg in Steitz, *Die Melanchthon- und Lutherherbergen.* Frankfurt, 1861, p. 51. Cochlaeus, *De Actis et Scriptis Lutheri,* ed. Paris, 1565, p. 33; Loescher, *Neueste Nachr.,* p. 167. *Bundschuh,* a shoe used chiefly by peasants during the closing period of the Middle Ages. It was large enough to cover the ankle and was fastened by straps across the foot. Since 1502 it became the name of a secret society of peasants, which was organized at Buchrain, in the bishopric of Speyer, for the purpose of resisting by force all governments except that of the Emperor. This society was the forerunner of the great Peasants' War. (Comp. R. Herold, *Der Bundschuh im Bistum Speyer vom Jahre 1502.* Greifswald 1889; also *Meyers Konversationslexikon, s. v.* "Bundschuh" and "Bauernkrieg.")

13) RA, 571.

14) Aleander, April 27. — Balan, 74. — Fuerstenberg in Steitz, 50.

15) Eccl. 10, 16. Fuerstenberg in Steitz, 51. RA, 873; Cochlaeus, Comm., 36.

would take up Luther's cause.[16] Cochlaeus suspected either Hutten or the humanist Hermann von dem Busche, who was at that time loitering at Worms of being the author of these manifestoes, while Aleander surmised that the counselors of the archbishop of Mayence, who were for Luther, had prepared these posters to intimidate their master. Among the *savants,* however, an opinion was current that the whole affair had been concocted by the papists in order to furnish the Emperor a pretext for rescinding Luther's safe-conduct.[17] This opinion was shared by Hutten,[18] and the Ebernburg, as a rule, was well informed regarding the plans of the knights.

The ruse had its desired effect on Albrecht of Mayence. He would have had to withstand the brunt of any uprising, and he knew that the peasants in the Odenwald and Spessart mountains had long been restive and seditious. As Aleander had expected, the Archbishop was at once completely terrorized. In the early dawn of the morning he sent a message to the Emperor and the princes, warning them not to take measures that might cause a revolt. Charles laughed at Albrecht's fears and at the new Scaevola[19] with his 8,000 conspirators. But there were others who thought that they were hearing a low rumbling underground, such as precedes an earthquake. Cochlaeus speaks of *"motus et murmura plebium"* (commotions and rumblings of the mob).[20] Presently Elector Joachim, the brother of Archbishop Albert, waited on the Emperor, and the Brandenburg prince, who had hitherto been the most zealous promoter of the cause of the papists, now proposed that — for God's sake! — further negotiations with Luther be instituted. Joachim found Aleander, as usual, in the antechamber of the Emperor and communicated to the nuncio the unanimous opinion of the Electors that in view of the prevailing unrest of the people Luther must not be sent home with-

16) Letter of April 27. RA, 559.

17) Walch, XV, 2310.

18) Letter of May 1.

19) C. Mucius, a noble Roman youth, gained his sobriquet *Scaevola* ("the left-handed") during the Etruscan invasion of Rome under King Porsena. He was chosen by lot from a band of conspirators to steal into the Etruscan camp and slay Porsena. By mistake he slew the king's secretary. Being instantly seized, he was put to the torture to force a confession from him, when he boldly thrust his hand into the fire and let it burn to show the king that he would reveal nothing. This heroism moved the king to pardon Mucius, who then told Porsena of the plot against him.

20) *Comm.*, 36.

out having had a hearing and without a real discussion of his grievances. This turned the scale in favor of Luther; the supreme council of the Empire took the stand which Luther had always taken and which Aleander had consistently opposed. Whatever seemed to have been gained by Luther's two hearings before the Diet now appeared worthless, and Aleander discreetly decided not to send his report of April 19 to Rome.

2. Five Useless Days for Luther.

Elector Joachim's proposition to begin negotiations with Luther was peremptorily rejected by the Emperor. But if the Emperor hoped to carry his point by showing firmness of purpose, he was speedily disillusioned. On April 20 the Estates submitted to him a request in French,[21] to the effect that Luther be examined with reference to his teaching by three or four well-informed men, who were to make an effort to induce him to recant his teaching. The reason given for this request was, lest the common people might say the Estates had outlawed Luther without giving him a hearing and without convincing him or even indicating to him which of his teachings were regarded as heretical. In case Luther would not recant, the Estates declared that they would consent to having him published as an outlaw. Under these circumstances Charles had to maintain his position alone. He refused to take any personal part in further dealings, nor would he send a representative to the conference with Luther. The Electors had to wait till April 22 before the Emperor wrote them that he would give them three days to obtain Luther's recantation. In case Luther recanted, the Emperor promised to act as mediator between him and the Pope and to obtain the Pope's pardon for him. If Luther refused to recant, he was to betake himself out of Worms after three days. For a parting shot the Emperor remarked that he could see no reason why there should be any further argument with Luther, inasmuch as a holy council of the Church had long ago condemned his teachings.[22]

Thus it happened that in spite of the wrath of the nuntii, the excommunicated heretic of Wittenberg tarried at Worms; and Cochlaeus reports that crowds of people with a grievance came to incite him to still greater rebellion.[23] Even the princes who so far had kept aloof began to visit Luther. Spalatin's account[24]

---

21) Balan, 71. 188 a. Ra, 598.
22) Fuerstenberg, RA, 872.
23) *Comm.*, 37.
24) *Annales*, 49.

states: "Many princes, counts, lords, knights, noblemen, priests, monks, and laymen called on him, not to mention the common people. They constantly besieged his dwelling and could not see enough of him." Among the callers, Spalatin mentions in particular Philip of Hesse, William of Brunswick, and William of Henneberg. Spalatin also records the fact that whenever Luther appeared in public, he caused a greater sensation than all the princes and lords.[25] The Landgrave of Hesse rode up to the hostel of the Knights of St. John and entered Luther's room with the cheerful greeting, "My dear Doctor, how are you?" Luther returned the cheerful reply, "Most gracious Sir, I hope that everything is turning out for the best."[26] Of Luther's teaching the young Landgrave seemed to know no more than this, that Luther, under certain conditions, would sanction bigamy.[27] Twenty years later that became a serious issue between him and Luther. Luther remarks: "His courtiers had insinuated that to him. But I laughed and said, 'O no, my gracious lord, your princely grace should not talk thus.' But he soon took his leave and, giving me his hand, said, 'If you are right, Doctor, may God help you!'"[28]

How deeply the masses were stirred by Luther's presence at Worms is illustrated by an anecdote which Selnecker has recorded on the authority of Caspar Storm, who supervised the callers that were coming and going at Luther's inn. The "godly Jews"[29] of Worms sent two delegates to Luther to present him with several bottles of good wine and to ask his opinion regarding some passages of the Old Testament on the meaning of which they were not agreed. But to the great amusement of the gentlemen who happened to be with Luther at the time, the Jewish delegates began to quarrel with each other, and thus their conference with Luther broke up.[30]

---

25) Oelhafen, the city counselor of Nuremberg, wrote home: "Whenever the monk walks down a street, crowds of people are standing and looking after him, and there is a great ado and much talking about him." (Riederer, *Nachr. z. Kirchengelehrten- und Buechergeschichte.* Altdorf, 1761. 4, 96; RA, II, 854.)

26) Bindseil, *Coll.*, III, 261; Walch, XV, 2247; Cordatus, *Tagebuch*, Ausg. v. Wrampelmeyer, No. 1000.

27) Comp. Erl. Ed., Op. Lat., V, 98—100.

28) XV, 1891.

29) See DTC, 237.

30) Selneccer, *Vita Lutheri Disput. Subj.* J. F. Mayer. Wittenb., 1687, 109.

Bucer [31]) was very busy during these days making reports to Hutten about Luther's doings and conveying a letter from Luther to the knight. Hutten did not delay his answer. He wrote that he was bursting with rage because Luther was not permitted to argue in defense of his teaching at the Diet. "Most invincible evangelist," he writes, "I see that bows and arrows, swords and guns, are needed to subdue the wrath of these devils." With this virtuous explosion the doughty knight, no doubt, believed that he had delivered a crushing blow to Luther's adversaries. To Luther himself he accords unstinted praise. Many had come to him, he says, expressing anxious concern about Luther's steadfastness. "If he only maintains his ground! If he only gives a manly answer! If only he is not intimidated!" To every one of these he had replied with supreme confidence, "Luther will be Luther!" and he had not been disappointed in his confidence.[32]) The knight manifests considerable embarrassment in explaining why in these critical days he keeps himself at a distance from the man whose image, alongside of his own, he loves to place on his polemical writings. He states that he would indeed consider it a great achievement if he could inaugurate some disturbance, some commotion, some riot; but Sickingen is always interfering with his heroic endeavors. His friends, Hutten thinks, are overcautious; from fear that he might attempt too much they force him to remain inactive. If it were not for this, he would have given the red hats something to think about by appearing before the very walls of Worms. We can understand that a sober head like Sickingen's beheld in the blustering of the knight nothing but the bravado of an irresponsible enthusiast. Still, Hutten threatens, it will not be long before he will break forth, and then Luther will see that he will not act truant either to the spirit which God has roused in him. "My dearest father," he expostulates with Luther, "yield not; remain unshaken! Let them bawl, cry out, and rave, but do you step fearlessly before the monster. You will not lack champions to defend and avenge you." He expresses an ardent desire to see Luther, "whom he loves so dearly," and asks Luther to keep him informed regarding anything that may happen to him. Once more, shortly before his departure from Worms, six days later, Luther sent Hutten a few lines, which moved the knight to tears.[33])

---

31) "Butzer, der in diesen Tagen sein Talent zum theologischen Botenlaeufer ausbildete." Hausrath in HAL, 280.

32) Letter of April 20. 33) Boecking, 59—62.

Sickingen, too, was hoping for a visit from Luther before the latter would return home.[34] His connection with this powerful knight in the immediate vicinity of Worms gave Luther a strong backing over against the friends of Aleander, who were still proving from the canon law that Luther's safe-conduct must not be kept. Spalatin even sought, through Bucer, to calm Sickingen; for he feared that the latter might declare that there had been enough talking, and now there must be action.[35] But it was soon made plain to Spalatin that the shrewd *condottiere* at the Ebernburg contemplated none of the terrible things which Spalatin anticipated; for Sickingen soon entered the Emperor's service.

Meanwhile Luther's speech in the Diet was circulating in manuscript copies in Worms. It had either been worked up from the notes which Luther had jotted down before he went into the Diet on April 18 or had been prepared by Luther after he had come out of the famous session of the Diet. Soon the speech appeared also in print, together with an account of the entire proceedings at the Diet during Luther's address. Aleander procured a copy of this print, which he forwarded to Rome later.[36]

Many transactions regarding Luther took place while the curtain was down upon the stage. Hutten hints at *secret* conferences with Luther which are taking place at Worms and claims Luther himself as his informer. He refrains from offering Luther any advice, because he — noble heart! — is confident, and all the friends that are with him are also confident, that Luther himself knows best the way he must pursue.[37] Most likely Hutten was referring to messages which were passing on the quiet between Luther and Glapion. Aleander[38] states that Glapion sent word to Luther that if he would recant such of his theses as had already been condemned as manifest errors, the rest of his affairs could easily be adjusted and disposed of. Glapion even announced his visit to Luther, but in the end stayed away.[39] Fuerstenberg, however, asserts that Armstorff and Glapion had made an attempt to approach Luther, but had been prevented from doing so by "Luther's people."[40]

---

34) Hutten's letter; EB, III, 126.

35) "Quod scriptum satis, nunc cogitandum, ut tandem aliquid agatur." Comp. *Sickingen*, von Ullman, 178.

36) Balan, No. 68, 177.

37) Hutten's letter of April 20. EB, III, 126.

38) Dispatch of April 27. BAL, 165.

39) RA, 62.

40) RA, 873. April 24.

Such were the wearisome experiences that filled Luther's sojourn at Worms until Jubilate Sunday (April 21) and two days after. Before supper on Tuesday, April 22, the Archbishop of Treves sent two priests to Luther with the message that he would be given another hearing regarding his doctrine.[41])

(To be continued.)

Luther's Ninety-Five Theses in the Light of Testimony Against Indulgences Before the Reformation.

(Conclusion.)

Not because he was the most learned man and his testimony is the most valuable, but because he lived earlier than other witnesses for the truth, we mention the name of Berthold of Regensburg (d. 1272) here, the greatest popular preacher of the Middle Ages, who, on his preaching tours through many countries of continental Europe, insisted on true sorrow over sin and a sincere confession of sins. He denounced penances without contrition and declared crusades and pilgrimages valueless unless they are combined with a firm purpose to renounce sin. From this standpoint Berthold raised his voice against the preachers of indulgences, whom he calls penny-preachers, *Pfennigprediger.* He was very severe in his denunciation of the sin of avarice and registered many a sharp thrust against misers; so we can well understand why the unholy business of the pedlers of indulgences roused his ire. He says: "When I was a child, we never heard of a penny-preacher"; and he condemns their activities in the most unsparing terms: "Shame on you, you penny-preacher! What about your tongue, which is leading many thousand souls to hell? You penny-preacher, you are one of the devil's dearest servants. . . . You are one of the worst of lepers whom the world has ever seen or may ever see; for your leprosy is so malignant that many are incurably infested therewith. You are a murderer. You are ruining numerous souls for Almighty God." (Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt,* Vol. I, 306ff.)

Celestine V, during his short pontificate of four months, in 1294, granted an *indulgentia a poena et a culpa,* but his successor, Boniface VIII (1294—1303), denounced this form of indulgences repeatedly because he considered them dangerous to the welfare of

41) RA, 560. 602.

men's souls. But his action seems to carry little weight because the *usus loquendi* from early times permitted the sense of a *remissio peccatorum* as granted by the indulgence (Herzog, *Realenzyklopaedie, sub* "Indulgenzen"), and Boniface himself issued one of this type and declared *non solum plenam, sed largiorem, immo plenissimam omnium suorum concedimus veniam peccatorum.* During the pontificate of John XXII (1316—1334) the most prominent canonists defended the term *indulgentia a poena et a culpa,* which, no doubt, caused the doughty John Wyclif (1324—1384) to protest against its use. Again, after the Council of Constance (1414 to 1418), this phrase seems to have fallen into disuse. (Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte,* § 118, 1.) We might note here that surprise was caused in France when Sixtus IV, August 3, 1476, issued an indulgence, the benefits of which were to be extended to the souls in purgatory, making the intercession for such unnecessary, as his indulgence mongers declared. But this doctrine as well as the doctrine of the *merita supererogata perfectorum* had been sponsored by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century, who followed Thomas Aquinas (Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte,* § 107, 2), and had been confirmed by Clemens VI in 1343. (Kurtz, *Kirchengeschichte,* § 118, 1.) Hence, the Frenchmen should not have been taken with surprise by the new and offensive doctrine.

Shortly before Luther's appearance as an opponent of papal indulgences, we find various men raising their voices against them because they were considered antagonistic to God's Word. There is John Veghe (d. 1504), a member of the Muenster House of the Brethren of the Common Life, who makes a clear and bold statement against this satanic institution. (Dargan, *History of Preaching,* Vol. I, p. 334.) There is John Pupper of Goch (d. 1475), held in high esteem by Matthias Flacius because he took a firm and a somewhat clear stand in matters of doctrine and against indulgences. The Council of Trent classed him among the archheretics and, in our estimation, signally honored him by placing his books in the first class of prohibited books. (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* I, 52. 72. 136. 138.) Oliver Maillard (d. 1502), preacher at the French court, inveighed against the sins of the day and no less fearlessly against the shameful traffic in indulgences. (Herzog, *Realenzyklopaedie, sub* "Indulgenzen.") The renowned Humanist and theologian Thomas Wyttenbach (d. 1526), the teacher of Zwingli in Basel, declared the mass a Roman fraud and cried against indulgences because the death of Christ alone is the recompense for our sins. (Dargan, *History of Preaching,* Vol. I, 401.)

Erfurt has special interest for us; in the first place, because it was the main center of reform movements in Germany (cp. Heinrich Boehmer, *Der Junge Luther,* p. 39) before Wittenberg became the citadel of truth and before Luther uprooted the age-long thorns and thistles of ignorance, superstition, and lies; and secondly, because Luther studied there and later lectured at the university for a short period (1509—10). Jacob of Jueterbock (d. 1465), prior of the Carthusian cloister in Erfurt, a pious monk of the first order, taught theology at the same institution of learning. The learned John Tritheim (d. 1516) describes him as one well versed in Scriptures, whose words were heeded and respected like Apollonian oracles. He saw the great need of a reformation, and in his *Opus de Indulgentiis* he attacked one of the outstanding abuses of the day. His opinion is rather mild and conciliating, but in one passage he denies the efficacy of indulgences in lessening the pangs of purgatory and condemns the *indulgentia a poena et a culpa,* as it was commonly understood. (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* Vol. I, 233ff.) We may, however, say with certainty that he did not encourage any person to purchase indulgences, but rather dissuaded men from investing their money in these fraudulent papers. John Ruchrath of Wesel (d. 1481) had studied at Erfurt when Jueterbock flourished there and later was a professor at the same university. Of him Luther says that his books were used extensively at the institution and that he had studied them to obtain his master's title (St. Louis ed., Vol. XVI, col. 2,243), and Wimpheling calls him an honor to the university. (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* I, 215.) Wesel was brought face to face with the traffic in indulgences in a most commanding manner at the time when Nicholas of Cusa, during the extension of the year of jubilee to 1451, came to Erfurt and caused such a commotion that several people were killed in a crush on St. Peter's Hill (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* I, 216), and again, four years later, when the fiery John of Capistrano came to Erfurt on a similar mission. Wesel appears as an outstanding pioneer in the crusade against indulgences. He does not only recognize certain abuses connected with the traffic, but he condemns the whole institution, as the title to his book already appears to promise, for it does not read *De Indulgentiis,* but *Johannis de Vesalia* ADVERSUS *Indulgentias Disputatio.* The following introductory remarks to his treatise have a truly Lutheran ring: "Since I am resolved to answer the question: Can the Pope absolve anybody from all punishments and grant him an indulgence? I, John of Wesel, rightful professor of the Holy

Scriptures, — the least though I am, — protest above all that I am not minded to say or to write anything contrary to the truth as it is contained in the Scriptures. Should my opinion or contention be adverse to that of others, the holy teachers not excepted, my remarks should not be considered as an aspersion of their honor or of their sanctity. I agree with holy Augustine, who said: 'The others, no matter how distinguished they may be as holy and erudite men, I read assentingly, not because it is their opinion, but because they convince me by Scriptures or by other patent reasons that they are not deviating from Scriptures.'" Although Wesel offers Scriptural proof for his seven propositions and, at times, uses correct verbiage when he speaks of sin and grace, yet he, like many of his times and of the same environments, misapplies Scriptures and produces unbiblical arguments. He, like many others and like Luther in his writings before October 31, 1517, again and again injects that papistical *gratia infusa*. We shall quote some of his correct statements: "God Himself effects the forgiveness of sins, produces it, and executes it." "If God is perfect, then His grace must be perfect; and, now, that grace alone can be called perfect which effaces temporal and eternal punishment." Wesel denies that the doctrine concerning indulgences can be based on the Office of the Keys, and he denies the existence of a treasury of good works of the saints. "Such remissions or abatements called indulgences are a holy fraud, by which the believers are deceived, as many other priests have said." He distinguishes between the congregation of believers, which he calls the Catholic Church and also the Church of Christ, on the one hand, and the Church in general, on the other hand, the latter the visible Church in our parlance. This latter Church, he says, errs. "When it is said, 'The Church grants indulgences,' these come from that part of the Church which errs." "The Church should not grant them because they are based upon an error." (Ullmann, *Reformatoren*, I, 240ff.)

Finally let us record that John Wessel's arguments against this worthless and devilish ware are much the same as those of his friend Wesel. He opposes his master at Rome when he asserts that man must not render personal satisfaction to make his repentance complete, because God's forgiveness of sins is entirely sufficient. "In the midst of the Christian Church it is considered an essential doctrine that forgiveness comes through God alone and is mediated through Christ." "The Lamb of God takes the punishment and the guilt of the present and future sins away." "The authority to forgive sins or to use the keys to the kingdom of

heaven, Christ imparted not to one, but to the Church in general." Wessel, too, brands indulgences as a pious fraud, an error, and a lie. (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* II, 491ff.)

More evidence could have been produced, and the material here offered could have been greatly enlarged upon, but this amply suffices to make a few comparisons.

Luther was acquainted with Wesel's works, as he himself tells us, and it would hardly be called a snap judgment if we take for granted that Wesel's stand regarding indulgences was known to him. True, Wesel was compelled to recant, but his influence was very marked at Erfurt, as we have heard Luther say. Luther was not acquainted with Wessel's writings at the time when he penned his Ninety-five Theses. (St. Louis ed., XIV, 253.) Both Wesel and Wessel are more outspoken in their denunciation of the papal ware. Both stamp it a fraud without any qualifications. Their words are very plain. But Luther says in his 49th thesis: "The Christians are to be taught that the Pope's indulgence is good as long as it is used rightly; but that there is nothing more harmful if the fear of God is ignored thereby." (St. Louis ed., XVIII, 76.) Thesis 71 quoted above is relevant also at this place. And Luther, in the following theses, is making concessions which Wesel and Wessel could not have conscientiously made: 5, 20, 26, 38, 39, 42, 61, 69. Whereas Wesel treats the superfluous good works of the saints as a nonentity, Luther, in Thesis 58, still looks upon them as a source of blessing, a view which he had expressed two years before. (Cp. St. Louis ed., XIX, 736.)

The history of indulgences offers, indeed, nothing but a babel of opinions, as Wesel and Wessel correctly asserted in their days, but at no time was it denied that it was a grant of freedom from certain penalties or penances laid upon the believers for the expiation of their sins. Dr. A. L. Graebner said to his students in a lecture: *"Der Papst hatte aus der Busze eine Bueszung gemacht."* Yea, the Church had become a penal institution. And it is Luther's contention that the Pope's power cannot, and is not intended to, go beyond such a grant. He says in Thesis 34: "For the grace of the indulgence refers only to the penances inflicted by men." In a sermon delivered October 31, 1516, Luther expresses the same opinion. (St. Louis ed., XIX, 752.) But whatever may be said about indulgences at any time, the one issued by Pope Leo X, which was to be offered to Christendom during a period of eight years (St. Louis ed., XV, 309), which, however, because of Luther's intervention, lasted but three years, promised the full forgiveness of

sins to its purchasers, with the exception of certain sins and crimes, real or fictitious, especially enumerated in the papal bull. In his official document Leo decreed that upon the purchase of his indulgence priest or monk should absolve "from all sins, transgressions, and iniquities, no matter how great or terrible the sins may be." (St. Louis ed., XV, 235.) The exceptions are also carefully noted at this place. One of a very peculiar nature has been explained in the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, Vol. V, 346f. Indulgences granted to individuals, containing an absolution in the sense mentioned are found in the St. Louis ed., XV, 280, 357. Albert of Mayence, in his instructions to all persons connected with the sale of this ware, expressly states that its purchase is necessary to salvation. (St. Louis ed., XV, 305.) In view of these facts it is difficult to understand why Luther's Ninety-five Theses do not measure up to the unqualified denunciation of the traffic as voiced by Wesel and Wessel. We dare not say that Luther had not read the papal bull or had not seen any of the letters of indulgence which plainly declared a complete release of all sins. Luther's respect for papal authority and his hesitancy to be too outspoken in his criticism of a papal arrangement at a time when he was seeking enlightenment seem to offer the best explanation.

Other comparisons are obvious, *e. g.*, that a host of men before Luther raised their voices in solemn protest against this satanic institution. We may safely assert that this issue was as much discussed before Luther's time as the Volstead Act or the Eighteenth Amendment are discussed by the press and by the people in our own days. Recall Luther's word: *"Alle Welt klagte ueber das Ablasz."* Recall that Wesel asserted *many* priests looked upon the indulgence as a fraud by which the believers were deceived.

But why these comparisons? They do not detract one whit from Luther's great influence upon the destinies of men as the Reformer of the Church, but they are to prove — as they prove most convincingly — that the Reformation is solely and entirely the work of God Himself. Jacob of Jueterbock presaged that the Reformation would not be brought about by one man. (Ullmann, *Reformatoren,* I, 197.) And it was not, nor even by many men. Luther was, indeed, when he penned his memorable theses, a most valiant knight, who championed the cause of the common people. Even though they were written in Latin and intended for the learned men, yet they manifest, in numerous cases, his interest in the welfare of the people. But in going forth into the fray, he grabbed a sword that was rusty and dull, and he fought against

an opponent whose wiles and knavery he underestimated. Under such conditions he could never have won against the tremendous odds if the Lord's day and time for the deliverance of His Church had not come. If we bear in mind what an insufficient tool the author of the Ninety-five Theses was, we shall know to whom all credit is due for the overwhelming success of Luther's work. The Reformation was a work of redemption, but of God alone. B.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

1 Tim. 6, 17. 18. — The possessors of great wealth have rare opportunities to "be rich in good works." Their wealth enables them to give not only their money, but also their time to the cause of the Church, the spreading of the Gospel, which is the best work of all. And if they are so situated that they can retire from the business of money-making in order to take up the business of soul-saving, not necessarily by entering the ministry, but by exercising their priestly office in the sphere of the many-sided work of the Christian layman, so much the better for the Church, so much the better for them. *The Western Christian Advocate* of September 22 tells of such men.

"Recently we heard of two men who were not only giving a tithe of, but all of their time, to the Church. One of them was a wholesale merchant in one of our large cities. He is a tither and has, through the years, been deeply interested in the Church. He has a religious experience that has made him beloved by all who know him. Recently he retired from business after having accumulated enough to make him independent, and now he is giving himself almost exclusively to the duties which Bishop Henderson may seek to accord him. Another man in a large city in the northern part of the State, a superintendent of schools, was offered a salary of $10,000 a year. This he refused, stating that the reason for his decision was that he had enough to enable him to be independent, and consequently he did not desire to assume any further responsibilities in the professional field. He has offered himself to Bishop Henderson to do whatever he can in promoting the church and encouraging the religious life and leading others to Christ. If the example of these two men could be followed by others, the Church would profit greatly."

God has also given our Church men who are able to give, and are giving, their whole time or a greater part or a great part of their time to the Church. If their example could be followed by others, the Church would profit greatly. E.

Mission Opportunities in Our Large Cities. — It has long been recognized that our main mission-fields in this country are the large cities, which are rapidly gaining in population. To the student of home mission work the city of Los Angeles presents some very interesting and startling data. With a total population of 1,350,000, it

has a total church membership of only about 290,000, leaving a remainder of 1,060,000 who are not members of any church organization. These statistics are based upon reports issued by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. The major Protestant denominations report as follows: Methodist Episcopal Church, 67 churches and 24,387 members; the Baptist denominations, 67 and 20,469; the Presbyterians, U. S. A., 47 and 20,184; the Disciples of Christ, 43 and 11,397; the Protestant Episcopal Church, 32 and 8,989; the Congregationalists, 39 and 8,690; the Lutherans, eight different bodies, 43 and 8,322. The Missouri Synod is represented by 26 churches and 2,815 members. In all, there were reported 142,625 Protestants, 131,000 Roman Catholics, and about 17,000 Jews. With regard to the many sects and cults that flourish in this great city, John S. McGroaty, as reported in the *Lutheran Church Herald,* says: "Maybe it is the climate, and maybe it is something else, but whatever it is, the fact remains that Los Angeles is the most celebrated of all incubators of new creeds, codes of ethics, philosophies and near-philosophies, and schools of thought, occult, old and new, and no day passing without the birth of something of this nature never before heard of." In its city directory it enumerates a large number of transient, nondescript sects such as: The Brotherhood of Light, the Church of the First Born of the United Sons of the Almighty, the Chinese Temple, the House of Prayer, the Home of Truth, Invisible Church of the First Born, Spiritualists, Theosophists, Anybody's California Adonijah, American Jerusalem Rapid Bible Mission, the Buddhist Temple, etc. The Christian Science Parent Church of the Transforming Covenant is a variety of the Christian Science movement founded by Mrs. Eddy. The Christadelphian Ecclesia has two assemblies. Unity Center, the Rosicrucians, the Church of Divine Power, the Church of the People, the Institute of Religious Science, and the Modern Church, have their regular place among the church advertisements in the Saturday newspapers.

Let us remember what Paul did at Corinth and in Rome; then we shall know what to do with cities like Los Angeles and others.

MUELLER.

The Authorized Version Defended and Praised. — Among the classical scholars of to-day, Prof. John A. Scott, of Northwestern University, ranks very high. What he has to say on the translation of any given Greek text deserves careful consideration. In the *Classical Journal* of October he discusses the translation of Matt. 5, 10, in which passage the Revised Version differs from the Authorized Version. We take pleasure in submitting the remarks of this eminent philologist to our readers.

"The authors of the Revised Version set as their goal the preservation of the readings of the Authorized Version except where change was demanded in order to give the clear meaning of the original Greek. Their first principle as announced in the Introduction was: '1. to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.'

"The Authorized Version translates Matt. 5, 10: 'Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake.' The Revised Version

has instead the words: "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake.'

"This change can be due only to the belief that the perfect *οἱ δεδιωγμένοι* cannot faithfully be represented by a present, but demands the sign of the perfect, the auxiliary *have*.

"In all ages the Greeks made the widest use of the perfect with present meaning, but examples will be given only from writers near the Gospel age. Strabo was of almost the same time, and he lived in Asia not far from the scenes of the Gospels.

"*Strabo*, XII, 10: *ἄκρα μεγάλη πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους τεταμένη.*
XIII, 1: *ἀντιπαρατέταται ἡ Λέσβος.*
XIII, 43: *ἡ Δαρδανικὴ ὑποπέπτωκεν Ἴδῃ.*
XVI, 26: *τὰ πρὸς μεσημβρίαν κεκλιμένα.*

"Another writer not in Greece proper and not far from the time of Matthew was Diodorus of Sicily, and from him have been selected these two perfectly clear examples: II, 38. 4: *ὁ Ἀράβιος κόλπος ἀνεστόμωται εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν.* V. 41: *ἡ Ἀραβία ἡ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν κεκλιμένη.*

"Nonnus gives this fine example of the use of the perfect to denote a present condition: XII, 145: *οὐ τέθνηκε, καὶ εἰ θάνεν.* 'He is not dead, even though he died.' Nonnus is, of course, considerably later.

"There is no doubt that the Authorized Version contains a true translation of the original Greek and, according to the first principle of the revisers, should not have been changed. The change was due to the fact that they confused the Latin and the Greek perfects. When Virgil said, *'fuit Ilium,'* he meant that Ilium's days were ended, but *Ἴλιος πέφυκε* or *ἔστηκε* would have meant something quite different.

"The early Greek grammarians had the true feeling for the meaning of the perfect when they named the present tense *ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος*, that is, the tense of the thing that having come into being still exists. Exactly similar to this *ἐνεστώς* is the phrase in Matthew *οἱ δεδιωγμένοι*, which does not mean those who, having been persecuted, are no longer persecuted, but those who are now persecuted.

"Any one who studies with appreciation the tenses of the Greek New Testament will be filled with admiration for the unerring instinct and fine discrimination shown therein by the translators of the King James Version."

Shallowness in American Life. — In its issue of July 28 the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* has an article by Lewis H. Chrisman, Professor of English Literature, West Virginia Wesleyan College, on "Is Life in America Growing More Shallow?" Among other things, Professor Chrisman says: "The failure of man to use his brains has been a tragedy of the centuries. . . . Real education is nothing more or less than the awakening, the quickening, and the developing of sane, wholesome, and upbuilding interests. A realization of this indubitable truth furnishes the student of modern life with some food for very serious thinking. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in a delightful account of her childhood home in the village of Litchfield, where Lyman Beecher preached his own brand of militant Cal-

vinism and ruled his household wisely and well, spoke of the atmosphere of her father's home as being charged with 'moral dynamite and intellectual electricity.' There are times when we have occasion to wonder whether American education, with all of its intricate machinery and its apparently limitless resources, is succeeding in the development of these qualities. . . . One rather effective way of estimating the intellectual life of a people is by a study of their reading." After admitting that "more books of genuine value are sold now than at any other period in the history of the people" and that "the higher type of magazines and reviews reports an increasing subscription list," the professor nevertheless says: "No one who faces the facts could think of denying that the typical American community is being afflicted with a veritable deluge of literary drivel." Not only is much of the reading done by the American public of a low type, but "in the middle-class American home books and papers play a less important part than they did twenty-five years ago."

The reason for the present shallowness in American life Professor Chrisman attributes in part to the automobile and the radio. He says: "Travel is being substituted for the printed page as a means of knowledge. . . . The significance of the radio lies not so much in that it can be heard as in what is heard. And its best, its chief value is due to its being a fine supplement to reading-matter rather than a substitute for it. We may motor from Dan to Beersheba; we may look at moving pictures evening after evening; we may listen to sound waves until our ears are sore, but without reading there can be no alert, vigorous, dynamic intellectual life." Another reason for our shallowness is given: "Perhaps the chief reason for shallow thinking and shallow living is our inability to use our leisure hours. Fewer working hours and improved household machinery have shortened the working-day of American men and women. But too frequently the free hours are not spent 'nobly or rationally.' In too many lives, amusement has become a vocation rather than an avocation. . . . The expenditure of time, money, and energy in the pursuit of inane amusement means the neglect of the higher interests. No one can spend his hours trivially without becoming trivial. Shallow thinking and shallow living go hand in hand. Strong characters are not developed in an atmosphere of social vapidity."

Mere reading, however, and the devouring of many books and much literature, even though it be good, will not serve its purpose, unless what is read is also mentally received and mentally digested. This Professor Chrisman stresses in the following words: "Reading, however, is not the most important part of the intellectual life. He who reads without thinking can hardly avoid becoming a pedant. But, as a rule, the assiduous reader is the consistent thinker. Generally the man who is too lazy to read is too lazy to think. Yet, if it could be proved that our lethargy in reading is due to our expending so much more mental energy in thinking, there would be no particular reason for pessimism. Unfortunately, though, we have no grounds for being optimistic in this regard. If the intelligence of people is

to be judged by their conversation, there is considerable evidence that American life is not supercharged with intellectual electricity."

This shallowness in American life is not only to be deplored on its own account, but also because "life was never more of a challenge to the intellectuality and the spirituality of man than it is right now. It is for the individual himself to say whether he is going to spend his days in the futile pursuit of worthless interests or live 'a life of greatness,' knowing that it is worth all that it costs." FRITZ.

Is the Assumption of Mary a Matter of Dogma, or Do Catholics Merely Believe It? — The form of the question gives no sense to the Protestant mind. But it is elicited by what the *Oriflamme,* the St. Louis Cathedral bulletin of August, has to say regarding the Feast of the Assumption, celebrated on the 15th day of August. "In the course of the ecclesiastical year with the Church we celebrate her many feasts of varying degrees of importance. Some commemorate great dogmas like the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity; others are the consequence of some popular devotion as the Feasts of the Holy Rosary, the Holy Family, and the Holy Name. The Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into Heaven comes between these two extremes and partakes of each of them. It is not dealing with a formally defined dogma of our holy religion, and yet it is much more than a mere popular devotion. In explanation of the term 'dogma' we may say a dogma is a truth of religion embodied in the deposit of faith left for safe-keeping by the divine Founder of the Catholic Church to His vicar, St. Peter, and his successors. The doctrines dealing with the Most Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the real presence of our Lord in the blessed Sacrament are among the principal dogmas of our holy faith. . . . Almost within our own times two other important dogmas of our holy faith have gained special prominence [the dogmas of the immaculate conception of Mary and of the infallibility of the Pope]. These two great truths, contrary to the opinion of some enemies of religion, were not created in 1854 and 1870, — no Pope can create a new religious truth, — they existed from the beginning, as attested by the faith of Catholics through all the centuries. The difference is that since their solemn definition by the Holy Father they have become *formal* doctrines of faith. . . . The doctrine dealing with the bodily assumption of Mary into heaven is in much the same state still as were the doctrines of her immaculate conception and papal infallibility before 1854 and 1870, respectively. Catholics have always believed that, though the blessed virgin died, God did not allow her body to become corrupt, but shortly after her death took it to heaven, where, her sinless soul and virginal body being reunited, she is in the glory of the New Jerusalem. But while this is the teaching of theologians and the pious belief and practise of Catholics, officially recognized by our Holy Mother, the Church, in all her liturgies, still, as we have said, we have not yet that formal declaration as in the case of so many truths of our holy faith. Historically we know practically nothing of the death, burial, and bodily assumption of the blessed Virgin. That she died we know; but when, where, or under what circumstances, we cannot say. We have many

charming legends, but few historical facts. And yet, though history fails us, we have another sure way of arriving at the truth in this case, that is, by inference, by deduction, logically, from other defined dogmas. In the XV. Psalm, the tenth verse, we read: 'Thou wilt not give thy holy one to see corruption.' This text is universally applied by Christian writers to the blessed Virgin and her bodily assumption, and with good reason. Genesis tells us that death is to be the punishment for sin. Since the blessed Virgin was conceived without sin, was immaculate in the very first moment of her existence, and remained so ever afterward, she was not subject to the penalty of sin—death.... She died, very probably, that she might resemble her divine Son and, like Him, become like to us in all things save sin. . . . What God will do for the just after centuries He has already done for the blessed Virgin. This, then, is the explanation of the doctrine of the assumption of the blessed Virgin. . . . *Holy Mary, pray for us now and at the hour of our death!* Amen."

A common believer does not know what to make of all this. 1) The Catholic theory of the dogma is a most complicated matter. A dogma, says the *Catholic Cyclopedia,* is a revealed truth defined by the Church (by the Holy Father, is the more honest definition of the *Oriflamme*), and there are three kinds of revealed truths, the third class being virtually revealed truths (such as the "truth" concerning the Assumption), "virtually revealed" meaning that they are not formally guaranteed by the word of the speaker, but are inferred from something formally revealed, and such a virtually revealed truth becomes a dogma when defined or proposed by the Church. We ask: Since all Catholics believe in the Assumption, though it is not a dogma, how will they believe in it when it does become a dogma? How many kinds of faith are at the disposal of Catholics? 2) Catholics have *not* always believed in it. The Feast of the Assumption was introduced and celebrated about the end of the sixth century. The apocryphal writing telling of Mary's dying in the presence of all living and dead apostles and a host of angels and midst countless miracles in Jerusalem and all the earth, of her burial in Gethsemane, of her empty grave fragrant with precious perfumes, and of her assumption into heaven was condemned by the *Decretum Gelasianum* in 496 with the words: *non solum repudiata, verum etiam ab omni Romana catholica ecclesia eliminata atque cum suis auctoribus auctorumque sequacibus sub anathematis indissolubili vinculo in aeternum damnata.* 3) Catholics do not require a firm foundation for their faith. "We have many charming legends, but few historical facts." And the *Catholic Cyclopedia* says the belief is founded on the apocryphal treatise *De Obitu S. Dominae.* 4) And yet Catholics are required to believe it (not with the dogma faith, but with the virtually-revealed-doctrine faith); for, says the *Catholic Cyclopedia,* "according to Benedict XIV it is a probable opinion which to deny were impious and blasphemous." 5) According to the *Oriflamme* Ps. 15, 10 (16, 10) gives explicit testimony to the Assumption. Why, then, are they speaking of only a "virtually revealed truth"? And by what right does the Pope refuse formally to define it? E.

Is the Bishop of Fargo Subject to the Pope? — *Our Sunday Visitor,* in order to correct the "queer idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy" harbored by the Protestants, issues a sort of declaration of independence in behalf of the Catholic bishops. But it is a declaration of independence which spells the most abject submission to the Pope. *Our Sunday Visitor,* as quoted above, did not dare to utter the declaration: "The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo." What it is permitted to say is: "The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo relative to the internal affairs of his diocese." The modifying clause turns the brave words of the declaration into an abject acknowledgment of the autocratic powers of the Pope. Of course, the Pope leaves the bishop of Fargo a relatively free hand in the administration of the internal affairs of his diocese. He may locate the diocesan seminary where he pleases. He need not submit the plans for the new cathedral to the authorities at Rome. But if the statement of the *Visitor* means anything, it means that the Pope does dictate to the bishop of Fargo in all other affairs. In matters of doctrine and polity the bishop is bound by the decision of the Pope. The *Visitor* has confirmed us in our "idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy." What would happen if the bishop of Fargo instructed his clergy to preach justification by faith or to discard the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope? The Pope would insist on immediate retraction or worse, and the *Visitor* would insist that, as these matters do not relate to the internal affairs of his diocese, he would have to submit to the dictation of the Pope and offer up the *sacrificium intellectus et conscientiae* at the altar of his lord. What the independence of the Roman Catholic bishops amounts to may be seen from the oath which, for instance, the French bishops are required to take when entering upon their office: "I shall do everything in order to preserve, defend, enlarge, and increase the rights, honor, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of the Pope, our master, and his successors. I shall humbly receive the commands of the Pope and execute them most punctually." (Transl. from *Lehre u. Wehre,* 47, p. 318.) And the *Visitor* will not assert that this does not apply to the bishop of Fargo. The bishop of Fargo is not superior to the archbishop of St. Paul. And Archbishop Ireland's declaration of independence of 1901 runs thus: "I have been in Rome as an obedient administrator of a province of the realm of Christ. I have done homage to him who rules, in the name of Christ, over the whole realm. I have accounted to him for my work." (*L. c.,* p. 88.) E.

Church History According to Rome. — It deals chiefly with fables and proposes to gain credence for them by coolly and persistently presenting them as facts. Its chapters on the Roman episcopate of Peter, on the *Donatio Constantini,* etc., are familiar instances. *Our Sunday Visitor* lives up to the best traditions of the Roman Catholic school of church historians. For the purpose of refuting the true statement that the Church in Britain was originally independent of Rome it repeats, in the issue of August 28, these fables: "Suppose the first missionaries in Britain did come from other quarters than

Rome. This will not help the rector's case. All of the churches of Asia Minor and France, in the fourth century, acknowledged the primacy of the Roman See. The papal legate, Hosius of Cordova, presided over the Council of Nicaea and signed the canons, which was necessary to give them validity. St. Augustine did not try to dictate to the Church in Britain. This Episcopalian rector seems to have a queer idea of the Catholic Church and the papacy. The Pope does not attempt to dictate to the Catholic bishop of Fargo relative to the internal affairs of his diocese; yet the bishop of Fargo acknowledges the primacy of the Pope and his jurisdiction over the universal Church. So also with the Catholic Church in Britain. It acknowledged the primacy of the Roman Pontiff." In all of this there is but one statement that agrees with the facts of history, and that is that Hosius of Cordova was a member and an influential member of the first ecumenical synod. All the rest is purely a Roman fabrication. Hosius was not the legate of Sylvester I. The Pope's legates were Vitus and Vincentius. But they did not preside. The names of the presidents are unknown. Some historians, of a very late date, mention bishops Eustathius of Antioch and Alexander of Alexandria; others, Hosius. The canons were not signed by any papal legate. Nor did any man at that time advance the claim that the "papal" signature was necessary to give them validity. The principal description of the synod is given by Eusebius of Caesarea and by Athanasius, and they know nothing of the presidency of the Roman legates. No contemporary writer tells of it. None of the older historians speaks of it. It is a Romish fabrication of a later date. More than that, the canons of the synod disprove the claim that at that time the Roman bishop exercised authority over the universal Church. The sixth canon denies that his authority extended even over the entire Western Church. And this canon was signed, according to the Roman historians, by the papal legate and thus became valid! This sixth canon prescribes that the bishop of Alexandria, "in accordance with the old customs, shall have jurisdiction over Egypt, in Libya and in Pentapolis, since it is also according to old custom for the bishop of Rome to have such jurisdiction, as also the churches in Antioch and in the other provinces." This canon, "signed by the papal legate," acknowledges that the Roman chair has a supremacy, but not over the Eastern dioceses and divisions, not over all the West, but only over the ten *suburbicarian* provinces belonging to the diocese of Rome. — At first glance one might admit the truth of a second statement. "The Catholic Church in Britain acknowledged the primacy of the Roman Pontiff." It did indeed. But the context creates the impression that the Church in Britain acknowledged the primacy of the Pope as a matter of course. As a matter of fact it was the result of the unholy machinations of the Romish emissaries. Augustine, the missionary sent by Gregory I, "did not try to dictate to the Church in Britain." Well, the times were not opportune for that. But the Pope himself indulged in more or less dictation — he bestowed upon Augustine archiepiscopal rights over the whole Saxon and British Church. And Augustine demanded that the Britons submit to his

authority. That looks like dictation; also his refusal to stand up, at a conference with the British chiefs, on their arrival. Whether he dictated or not, the Britons at that time, in 605, refused to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome. They submitted in 664, owing to the eloquence and skill in intrigue of Abbot Wilfred. E.

Universalists are Unitarians. — In the *Christian Leader,* the organ of the Universalists, John Murray Atwood, president of the Universalist General Convention, who ought to be able to speak with authority, says: "Ever since Hosea Ballou became a Unitarian in 1795 and led the way, the Universalist Church has been overwhelmingly Unitarian. I would say that you could count the professed Trinitarians on the fingers of one hand. To be sure, there is nothing in our principles of faith or polity that forbids one to be a Trinitarian. But as a matter of fact, the case is as stated."

This answers the question which the *Watchman-Examiner* puts: "Are Universalists Unitarians?" Moved by the large number of Modernists, whom the Baptists tolerate in their denomination and who are on the increase, this periodical might propound to its own denomination the query, "Are Baptists Unitarians?" If not, why tolerate men of professed unbelief and practise fellowship with them?

MUELLER.

The Religion of Dr. Jacks.—When, recently, the *Hibbert Journal* observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding, the editor, Dr. Jacks, who has been in charge of it from the very beginnng, spoke as follows: "Labor is a thing to love with all our mind and heart and soul; to be clothed with all the excellence and beauty it admits of. That, I think, is the religion of the future. For my part, if they ask me on the Day of Judgment what denomination I belong to, I shall tell them, I hope with due modesty, that I was baptized into the sect of the laborers. And I shall hold out my worn-out pen and my old blotting pad, and I shall say: 'These are the only passports I have into the kingdom of heaven.'" This is the speech of a man who does not know the meaning of sin and grace. But when we hear that Dr. Jacks is principal of Manchester College, the theological school affiliated with Oxford University for the training of Unitarian ministers, we shall not marvel at the self-righteousness on which he stakes his hopes for salvation. The *Hibbert Journal,* by the way, is a sort of open forum, where all sorts of opinions find expression.

Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

From the U. L. C., information reaches us that the Rev. Ezra K. Bell, D. D., who for 10 years was president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America, died at his home in Baltimore on September 13.

Rev. Oscar N. Olsen, who for a little over a year has held the position of editor of the *Lutheran Companion,* of Rock Island, Ill., has resigned that position to fill the chair of English Bible, Biblical Literature, and Ethics at Augustana Theological Seminary, located in the same city. (N. L. C. B.)

The *National Lutheran Council Bulletin* informs us that plans are on foot to merge the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the Synod of East Pennsylvania, and the Susquehanna Synod of Central Pennsylvania. This would

mean that the oldest Lutheran Synod of America (Pennsylvania Ministerium) would lose its identity. The three synods mentioned are constituent district synods of the U. L. C.

The University at Dorpat has observed the three-hundredth anniversary of its founding. It was established by Gustavus Adolphus in 1627, when he was encamped at Nuremberg.

The *Christian Century* takes note of the fact that during the year ending June 1 Chicago Lutherans led in numerical gain. It says that the Lutheran Church reported three times more accessions than its nearest competitor, the Presbyterian Church. The Lutherans added 15,186 members; the Presbyterians, 4,947. To what extent Synodical Conference congregations figure in these gains is not indicated in the item.

When Jean Henri Fabre, world-famous entomologist, was asked whether he believed in God, he replied, according to the *Presbyterian:* "I cannot say I *believe* in God; I *see* Him. Without Him I understand nothing; without Him all is darkness. Not only have I retained this conviction, I have aggravated or ameliorated it, whichever you please. Every period has its mania. I regard atheism as a mania. It is the malady of the age. You could take my skin from me more easily than my faith in God."

Another good item from the *Presbyterian* deserves being quoted: "Under God, the Protestant Reformation was the work of one man, Martin Luther. Luther did nothing but preach, teach, write. When certain turbulent spirits of the Reformation thought they had to 'do' something and were demolishing papist churches and breaking images, Luther came from his seclusion in the Wartburg and preached a series of sermons that put a stop to this iconoclasm. He told the people to let the Word do the work and said that, while he and Philip [Melanchthon] were doing nothing, his words were spreading like a fire throughout the length and breadth of Germany and bringing in the Reformation." This little paragraph describes the nature of the Reformation more accurately than many a large book.

117 bishops of the Orthodox (Greek) Church are either imprisoned in Russia or living in exile in Siberia. A glorious era of liberty which the Soviets have inaugurated!

We are told that there are 20,000 Jesuits, 4,000 of whom are engaged in mission-work. In point of numbers they seem to be the strongest order in the Roman Church. That they hold this rank in point of influence is, of course, well known.

Recent investigations as to the character of the small pyramids which are found in the neighborhood of the large royal pyramids and until now were considered mausoleums in honor of the queens, seem to show that these piles were not erected for sepulchral purposes, but for religious uses connected with the worship of the sun carried on in Heliopolis.

BOOK REVIEW.

Schrift und Bekenntnis. Theologisches Zeitblatt, herausgegeben von der Synode der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Sachsen und andern Staaten. Achter Jahrgang, Juli bis Oktober 1927. Price of subscription, M. 2, for six months. (Schriftenverein [E. Klaerner], Zwickau, Saxony.)

Our brethren in Germany, as has been stated a number of times in our periodical literature, issue a theological bimonthly called *Schrift und Bekenntnis.* It is a well-edited journal, the editor-in-chief being Rector M. Willkomm of the Seminary at Berlin-Zehlendorf. The number before us is a double one and is of special interest because it is dedicated to the venerable Dr. H. Z. Stallmann on the occasion of his eightieth birthday.

It is a splendid gift, recognizing in a worthy manner the faithful services which Dr. Stallmann has rendered the cause of true Lutheranism in Germany. The articles offered are the following: "Pneumatische Exegese," by Dr. Mezger; "Luther und der 'Homberger Entwurf,'" by Rector Willkomm; "Der biblische Urtext und die christliche Gemeinde," by P. Peters; "Das Evangelium und unsere Gegenwart," by H. Koch; "Vermischtes." The number concludes with a biographical sketch of the theologian who is honored and whose photograph is reproduced on the first page.

Die Bibel oder Die ganze Heilige Schrift Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers, mit in den Text eingeschalteter Auslegung, ausfuehrlicher Inhaltsangabe zu jedem Abschnitt etc. von *August Daechsel.* Dritter Band. (A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig.) $3.35. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

The third volume of Daechsel's famous commentary treats Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles. An appendix contains the apocryphal books Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) and the Wisdom of Solomon. One moves in an atmosphere of sound scholarship and deep reverence as one pages through this work. The comments are full, rich, pertinent, and edifying. A feature which a Lutheran theologian welcomes is the great number of quotations from the works of learned, pious exegetes. Naturally we cannot endorse every statement made. For instance, the assumption that Ecclesiastes is not from the pen of Solomon we cannot sanction, in view of the plain declaration of the book itself. This applies, too, to the chiliastic interpretation of Canticles. But on the whole we can say that the work deserves a place in the library of every Lutheran pastor and teacher.

An Outline of the History of Doctrines. By *E. H. Klotsche, A. M., Ph. D., D. D.*, professor of Exegesis and Symbolics in the Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebr. 249 pages; $1.75. (The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

We wish to congratulate both the publishers and the author for presenting to American students this *Outline of the History of Doctrines.* In no other field is the supply of good text-books, compends, and more comprehensive works, in the English language, so limited as in the one which the author enriches by his contribution. He has done valuable pioneer work, which we hope will be followed by still greater efforts. As is evident, his book has grown out of his class work, which no doubt accounts for the clearness, conciseness, and accuracy with which the material is presented. The doctrinal views of Luther ought to be presented in much greater detail since his influence on Christian dogma has been tremendous. Greater space ought also to be accorded to the controversies in the Lutheran Church after the Reformer's death. In Lutheran seminaries these subjects are amply given consideration in Symbolics, but not every reader of the *Outline* is a graduate of a Lutheran seminary. We recommend also that the author's statements should be confirmed by brief quotations from the works of the writers whose views he represents. This is certainly necessary in a discussion where the views of prominent men are considered.

MUELLER.

A System of Natural Theism. By *Leander S. Keyser, D. D.*, professor of Systematic Theology, Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, O. Second, revised edition; 159 pages; $1.35. (The Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Iowa.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Keyser's *System of Natural Theism*, primarily intended for a textbook in colleges and theological seminaries, has found so ready a market that it appears in a new, revised, and enlarged edition. It is a compendium worthy of careful study and easy to study, since the author presents the material in a clear and gripping manner. Part III, which deals with the various antitheistic theories, such as atheism, materialism, deism, pantheism, idealism, evolutionism, agnosticism, monism, pluralism, positivism, pragmatism, etc., is perhaps the most important section of the book. The unchristian theories are clearly represented and ably confuted. It may be well for the author in a possible third edition to mention the main representatives of the different theories and to support his claims by brief quotations from their works. This will make the work more valuable to the student. The bibliography is excellent. MUELLER.

"After Its Kind." The First and Last Word on Evolution by *Byron C. Nelson, Th. M.* 144 pages, 5½×8. (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.)

One of the most readable of recent texts discussing the evolutionary theory from the standpoint of Christianity. Mr. Nelson wrote these chapters as a thesis for the S. T. M. degree at Princeton University. The arguments from vestigial organs and from Mendelism are particularly well presented. GRAEBNER.

A Short Introduction to the Gospels. By *Ernest De Witt Burton.* Revised by *Harold R. Willoughby.* 156 pages. $1.75. (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.)

Dr. Burton's *Short Introduction* first appeared in 1904 and was followed by four "impressions" between 1906 and 1917, which proves the general demand for the book. Before his death Dr. Burton contemplated a revised edition containing his theory on John's gospel. Death intervening, the work was entrusted, in accord with the author's own wish, to his colleague H. R. Willoughby, who carried it out in the spirit of his departed friend. Dr. Burton's book purposes to place before the student of the gospels "those facts concerning the purpose and point of view of each of them which are most necessary for an intelligent reading and study of them." This limits its scope. It discusses only the most important questions regarding the gospel, although the "Appended Notes" give additional historical and critical information. The author's viewpoint is, in the main, conservative, although in very many instances he departs from the traditional views, as, for instance, when he denies the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel, though he suggests no definite author. The inductive method which the writer follows is very helpful in leading the student to draw his own conclusions. Students of the gospels will do well to compare Dr. Burton's *Short Introduction,* since it is the work of a man whose scholarship was unquestionable. MUELLER.

The Fact of Prayer. Its Problems and Possibilities. By *John Elliott Wishart, D. D., LL. D.*, professor of Church History, San Francisco Seminary. With introduction by *Melvin G. Kyle*, president of Xenia Theological Seminary, St. Louis. 225 pages. $1.75. (Fleming H. Revell Company, New York.)

Dr. Wishart, for many years professor in Xenia Theological Seminary, of the United Presbyterian Church, presents to the Christian public a very serviceable and devout discussion of the vital subject of prayer. The author is an earnest believer in the Bible and proves the necessity and validity of Christian prayer, which are denied by Modernists, evolutionists, and the whole mob of present-day pagans. His work is an able and convincing apologetic, clearly conceived and excellently represented. Of special value for our time is the chapter on "Prayer and Bodily Healing," in which the writer deals with the errors of Faith-healers and Christian Scientists. We recommend the book to our pastors for appreciative, though critical study since not every detail will meet with the approval of a Lutheran minister.

MUELLER.

Life and Letters of Paul. By *Thomas Carter, B. D., D. D.*, professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in Vanderbilt University. $1.00. (Publishing House of the M. E. Church, South, Nashville, Tenn.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a neat little book of 231 closely printed pages, which can be recommended to our pastors and teachers for the preparation of lectures on the life and letters of the greatest of the apostles. The social, political, and religious background is sketched, and the wonderful story of Paul's life is told in a straightforward, pleasing manner. In his conception of the historical problems involved, the author moves in traditional channels. The missionary endeavors of the apostle are given special prominence. About one half of the book is devoted to a discussion of the various letters of Paul; information is given regarding the occasions upon which they were written and their contents. To some of the statements one must take exception. For instance, Paul himself certainly would have objected to the statement found p. 216 with reference to his "theory" of the atonement that "this theory need not be absolute for Paul or any other man." In the final chapter the doctrine of justification ought not to have been passed over in silence.

Eclogae Graecolatinae. *Fasc. 1: Augustins Confessiones in Auswahl.* Herausgegeben von *A. Kurfess.* Dritte, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Heft von 32 Seiten. M. .70. (Verlag und Druck von B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Germany.)

We know what men of power Paul and the apostles were, and we know what a spiritual giant Luther was; but what of the many preachers who lived and labored during the more than a thousand years between Paul and Luther? Let us say at once that during these more than ten centuries there is not a man, a leader, or a teacher of the Church who could be placed beside Paul or Luther. True, there were Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, — these names will never lose their luster. But none of them can be compared with an apostle or even with Luther. One of their number, though he does not approach Paul or Luther, outshines all the rest, and that is St. Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo Regius, in

Northern Africa. In the millennium between Paul and Luther no one arose to lead and teach the Christian Church whose writings have continued to exert that influence which the writings of this great African bishop exert to this day. Catholics and Protestants alike revere this man. Before Luther, thousands of Christian pastors and leaders drew light and encouragement from his writings. Luther's high esteem for him, the diligence with which he studied this bishop's writings, and the consequent influence which Augustine exerted upon Luther are too well known to need further comment. Should not a Christian theologian be acquainted with the most important writings of this chief teacher of the Christian Church in an entire millennium? Few, it is true, can hope to read all that St. Augustine wrote, but his *Confessions* at least should be known to every pastor. Why, there are many laymen who have read translations of them. Without question this book is the best-known religious treatise written by a Christian in those thirteen centuries between Paul and Luther. The *Confessions* of St. Augustine have therefore also been issued again and again in the original and in translations. Now the well-known firm of Teubner in Leipzig has gotten out an abridgment of this autobiography. They were moved to do this by two considerations. In the first place, not all that St. Augustine wrote in his *Confessions* is of equal merit. There are some repetitions, there are prayers, and there are frequent exclamations which may be omitted without cutting the sequence of the narrative. By excluding these, the reader is spared labor and expense. In the second place, the publishers wished to offer some collateral reading to the advanced student of classical Latin in the German *Gymnasium*. But such an abridgment may also serve another purpose; it may be given to those who hesitate to attack at once the large tomes of this prolific author. But having been persuaded to read these brief extracts, many may wish to peruse more, all of the *Confessions* at least. And even though one read no more than these extracts in Teubner's *Eclogae*, that will be of benefit, for the selections have been made with excellent judgment. So well has the editor, *A. Kurfess*, grouped his extracts that an interesting narrative, unbroken by disturbing omissions, is the product.

From the first book there is retained St. Augustine's famous statement: "*Quia fecisti nos ad te et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te.*" The sequence of the story is never lost sight of. The sins of his youth, the death of his friend, his entrance into the communion of the Manicheans, and his meeting with that ignorant ranter Faustus, their bishop, is related. Then his meeting with Ambrosius, the spiritual and learned bishop of Milan, his struggle and his conversion, the death of his mother, and his regret that he turned to the Lord so late in life, — all this is narrated. We have also the words of Monica, when she was asked whether she wished to be buried near her husband: "'*Ponite,*' *inquit, 'hoc corpus ubicumque. Nihil vos eius cura conturbet. Tantum illud vos rogo, ut ad Domini altare memineritis mei, ubiubi fueritis.*'" These words are quoted by Romanists in an attempt to prove their doctrine concerning masses for the dead. But who gave to this old lady, Monica, though she was ever so good a Christian, the right to issue articles of faith? And even so, what do her words say of masses for the dead? — The story of Augustine's conversion is given in full. Everywhere the editor offers explanatory notes and translations of words and phrases of later Latin.

We cannot agree with all his interpretations, *e. g.*, *βαπτίζειν* = *untertauchen*. There are, moreover, too many translations, for such words as *caligo*, *caterva*, *flagellum*, and many more of frequent occurrence in classical Latin should be known to the reader. He has drawn largely upon von Raumer's notes in that author's excellent unabridged edition of this work. Let us hope that some will make a beginning by reading these brief extracts and then proceed to read at least ten books of St. Augustine's biography, the most celebrated work, in a thousand years, of the Christian Church. S.

Representative Churchmen of Twenty Centuries. A Cross-Section of Christian History and Endeavor. By *Hugh Watt, D. D.*, Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh. 256 pages, 5×7½. $2.25. (George H. Doran Co., New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House.

This book is from the *Living Church Series*, edited by Prof. John E. McFadyen, D. D., of the United Free Church College, Glasgow. It is a most delightful volume. The task of the author was to choose one representative man from each century of the Christian era, and although, as he states in the preface, his first impulse was to refuse because of the obvious difficulties connected with such selections, we believe he performed a very successful piece of work. That Dr. Watt is thoroughly at home in his field becomes evident at once. He is master of his subject and has the additional happy gift of vivid presentation. His characters live and act. There is not a tedious paragraph in the whole volume. That not every one will agree with his choice of men is self-evident. Nor can we agree with every statement or conclusion. We would, however, heartily recommend the book to our brethren in the ministry. It will repay careful study. Not the least valuable part of the book is the author's admirable single-page analysis of the leading features of each century with which he prefixes each study. The language is chaste, fresh, vigorous, and picturesque. *Tolle, lege!* W. G. P.

Christ and Money. By *Hugh A. Martin, M. A.* 110 pages, 5½×7½. $1.00. (George H. Doran Company, New York.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a stimulating book. We have long been convinced that what the Bible teaches in reference to the use of money has not been receiving sufficient attention. Says Mr. Martin: "The late Principal Denny is reported to have declared that more is said about money in the New Testament than about anything else. The name of the reputed author prevents one from dismissing the startling statement without thought. While, as an arithmetical proposition, its accuracy may be questioned, it goes sufficiently near the truth to be a valuable challenge to the common neglect of the subject in Christian teaching to-day. Problems of property, of getting and spending, absorb a very large proportion of modern life, and there are but few of the evils in our social order that are not rooted in them. Yet most of us, in pulpit and pew alike, just ignore what our Lord has to say or explain it away." Of course, the larger stewardship must be taught, and this, in fact, is fundamental in teaching Christian giving. Of the poor Macedonians, who contributed "to their power, yea, beyond their power," it is said that they "first gave their own selves to the Lord."

2 Cor. 8, 3. 5. "Christian giving," as Martin correctly says, like the Christian use of money in general, "must be the expression of an attitude of life." The relation which money has to a man's character as well as to his religion is emphasized in the following words: "'Money talks,' they say. It does. It will tell you well-nigh all you need to know about a man if you know how he gets and spends his money and what he thinks about it. The quantity owned does not affect the question. Alike for the casual laborer or the millionaire, what he does with his money reveals his character. . . . If a man's religion does not affect his use of money, that man's religion is vain. True religion is not a separable compartment of life; it permeates and molds and directs all living. We may count upon the guidance of God's Spirit as truly in the use of money as in the saying of our prayers." Martin's book has the following chapter-heads: The Value of Money; The Teaching of Jesus; The Rights of Property; The Acquisitive Motive; Personal Expenditure. FRITZ.

The Publishing House of J. F. Steinkopf, Stuttgart, Marienstr. 11, Germany, has sent us the following books: —

1. **Hans Nielsen Hauge, der Erwecker Norwegens.** By *Jacob B. Bull.* $1.50.

A vivid account of the Pietistic reaction in Norway, in the nineteenth century, against Rationalism.

2. **Der Prophet der Wildnis.** Eine historische Erzaehlung vom Durchbruch des Lebens in Finnland. By *Auk Oravalta.* Translated into German by *Cornelie Rocholl.* $1.50.

The hero of the story is a Pietist, who made a deep impression on the Church of Finland, Paavo Ruotsalainen.

Funeral Hymns. 30 pages, 6×9. 30 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

Twenty-nine funeral hymns with notes are given in a substantial flexible binding. Experience has taught that people do not bring their hymn-books to the cemeteries and that, therefore, the singing must usually be done by the pastor and a few others. A congregation will do well to purchase a sufficient number of copies of *Funeral Hymns* to be used at the committal services. FRITZ.

A Guide to the Understanding of the Old Testament. By *John Edgar McFadyen, D. D.*, professor of Old Testament Languages, Literature, and Theology at United Free Church College, Glasgow. 189 pages. Cloth, $2.25. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

What shall Modernists, who reject the doctrine of inspiration together with every other distinctive Christian doctrine, do with the Bible? None of them desires to see it cast aside as an outworn book. How, then, should it be used? All these questions are briefly and simply answered in this popular, but detailed representation of the modernistic view of the Scriptures. The book is divided into three parts. The first part shows the modernistic attitude toward the Bible; the second, the various books of the Old Testament, their origin and development according to the theories of the destructive higher critics; the third illustrates the religion of

the Old Testament, as seen by the Modernist to-day. Anybody wishing to orient himself without devoting too much time to the vagaries of unbelieving critics will find this volume useful. As a guide, Professor McFadyen is thoroughly reliable, since he knows the subject which he treats well enough, having worked in this particular field for many years. The treatment of the subject-matter is lucid and clearly outlined. MUELLER.

Modernist Fundamentalism. By *J. R. P. Sclater, D. D.* $1.25. (George H. Doran Co., New York.)

The author of this book, it seems to the reviewer, would like to remain on good terms with both Fundamentalists and Modernists. He is looking for a mediating position, and as a result his book will appeal only to the half-way people, who, of course, are numerous enough. The inerrancy of the Bible, as might be expected, is thrown on the scrap-heap. The author seems to know the negative critics, whom he defends, very little, ascribing to them, if I understand him correctly, belief in the deity of Christ and having words of praise for Loisy, the arch-heretic, who dates the Gospel according to St. Luke about 130 A. D. From the point of view of accuracy the book is not an admirable performance. It may render service to such as have to inform themselves on the present-day theological tendency to establish concord between Christ and Belial.

What to Preach. By *Henry Sloane Coffin, D. D.* $2.00. (George H. Doran Co., New York.)

Dr. Coffin, now professor at, and president of, Union Seminary, is known in the main for two qualities, that of having a brilliant mind and that of being an outspoken Modernist of the Fosdick type. Both qualities are in evidence in this book. Much of what the author says in the five lectures, which are superscribed, respectively, expository preaching, doctrinal preaching, ethical preaching, pastoral preaching, evangelistic preaching, is sound and stimulating, but it is all shot through with the poison of what we might term present-day Gnosticism, namely, Modernism. What a tragedy that such talents are wasted on the construction of a house which has no abiding foundation!

The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania. By *C. Hale Sipe, A. B.*, member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. 569 pages, 6×9. $5.00. (Ziegler Printing Company, Butler, Pa.)

The subtitle of the book announces it as "A Story of the Part Played by the American Indian in the History of Pennsylvania." It contains much that is of considerable interest to Lutherans. Reference is made in the sketch of the Susquehannas to the relations between the Swedes on the Delaware and these Indians. In chapter III a fuller treatment is given of the Swedish Lutheran colonists, whose just treatment of the Delawares laid the foundation for William Penn's success. In the chapters on Shikellamy the great services of Conrad Weiser are set forth. In fact, Weiser's name runs pretty much all through the book. On pages 243—247 are the stories of Regina Hartman and of the Reichelsdorfer girls, made captive by the Indians. The book has received high praise from specialists in Colonial history and contains an introduction by Dr. G. P. Donehoo, student of American Indian affairs. GRAEBNER.

GLAD HOSANNAS.

A Collection of Sixty-Three Christmas Chorals and Carols.

By WALTER WISMAR.

To be compelled to select a dozen suitable Christmas-songs from about as many different collections frequently has been the disagreeable experience of those arranging Christmas programs for children. And after the selections were made, there arose the problem of putting them into the hands of the children. Those who have labored under such and similar difficulties will appreciate this new collection of chorals and carols that are published in handy form. Among the sixty-three selections there are twenty arranged for two-part and five for two-and-three-part singing.

To say that Walter Wismar has compiled the collection is to stamp it as one that contains choice selections, a fact borne out by the names of the following composers that are represented: Haendel, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schumann, Bortnianski, Gruber, Crueger, and Praetorius.

The booklet measures 6×9 and contains 72 pages, which are sewed into substantial flexible paper covers. The special Christmas design printed in green on the red-colored front cover gives the booklet a cheerful holiday aspect. Price, 35 cts. the copy; 25 cts. in dozen lots; 20 cts. in hundred lots.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

"SOUNDING JOY."

This collection of Christmas anthems, arranged for mixed voices, is recommended for the approaching holiday season. The compiler, Mr. Walter Wismar, has selected forty-two favorite and classic Christmas carols, many of which have delighted the hearts of young and old for generations. Some of the best-known composers are represented — Bach, Haendel, Mendelssohn, Crueger, Gruber, Praetorius, and others.

Church choirs especially will welcome this collection, as church concerts at Christmas-time are gaining in favor, and also because of the fact that congregations respond much more readily to an old-time favorite Christmas hymn than to the lengthy and more difficult selections that are sometimes rendered during the Christmas service. It has also become a laudable practise for our young people to go caroling in the community and in institutions. The collection lends itself well for this purpose. Young people's societies find much pleasure in singing the songs of their childhood days, and here again this collection will render good service.

Price, 35 cts. a copy, postpaid; dozen, $3.36, plus postage; hundred, $23.00, plus postage.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE,
3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.